

## **REMARKS**

Claims 1-11 and 13-23 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102**

Claims 1, 7-17 and 20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Martin, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,045,887). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note that claim 1 includes the limitations of “a sheet material having ... a body portion and a tip portion, said tip portion being separable from said body portion and defining a separate region of said sheet material relative to said body portion, the body portion being provided with a first configuration adapted to be used with a first platen configuration and having first segments defining regions of weakened material, wherein said sheet material is adapted to be separated along said first segments to change a configuration of said body portion of said sheet material to correspond with a second platen configuration having different external dimensions.” Independent claim 17 includes similar limitations with the exception that the “segments defining regions of weakened material” have been changed to “marking segments”.

Applicants respectfully submit that Martin, et al. '887 does show a tip portion 5 separable along perforations 7 from the body portion 3, however, the body portion 3 does not further include "segments defining regions of weakened material, wherein said sheet material is adapted to be separated along said first segments to change a configuration of said body portion of said sheet material to correspond with a second platen configuration having different external dimensions", as claimed. Specifically, the weakened region 7 of Martin, et al. '887, merely separates the tip portion from the body portion and does not define a second configuration of the body portion for corresponding with a second platen configuration with different external dimensions, as claimed. Applicants note that Fig. 2 of Martin, et al. '887 merely show the removal of the tip portion, not a second configuration as asserted by the Examiner. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

#### **REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103**

Claims 2-6, 18-19 and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martin, et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,045,887) in view of Pearce (U.S. Pat. No. 5,367,839). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants note that claims 2-6, 18-19 and 21-23 are dependent upon independent claims 1 and 17 and, therefore, should be allowable for at least the same reasons, as discussed above. Therefore, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection are respectfully requested.

## CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Feb. 2, 2005

By: Ryan W. Massey  
Ryan W. Massey, Reg. No. 38,543

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.  
P.O. Box 828  
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303  
(248) 641-1600

RWM/saf

G:\rmassey\0275S\000563\Amendment to OA dated 11.02.04.doc